DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 213 334 HE 014 798

TITLE	The Challenges Ahead: A Planning Agenda for California Postsecondary Education, 1982-1987.
INSTITUTION	California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.
REPORT NO	CPEC-81-25
PUB DATE	Nov 81
NOTE	43p.; For related document see HE 014 799.
AVAILABLE FROM	California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1020 12th Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Standards; *Access to Education; Accountability; College Administration; *College Planning; Educational Objectives; *Educational Quality; Enrollment Trends; Financial Problems; Nontraditional Students; *Postsecondary Education; *Statewide Planning; Undergraduate Study
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

California's goals for postsecondary education and major environmental factors that influence the attainment of these goals are reviewed. Goals stated by the California Postsecondary Education Commission are to provide access for residents to participate in the type of undergraduate education for which they are qualified, without restrictions due to their background; to provide institutions and programs that provide excellent instruction, research, and public service; and to manage finances and programs in a manner that will facilitate access and promote excellence. Attention is directed to major problems likely to confront California's colleges and universities over the next five years including economic factors (such as state funding), demographic influences (such as the decline in the college-age population) or sociopolitical concerns. External environmental forces affecting postsecondary education in the state include: an aging population, a majority of minorities, and increasing energy costs. Internal environmental factors include enrollment-derived funding formulas, tenure, and collective bargaining. Nine priorities for 1982-86 are as follows: improved planning and program review, improving student preparation and skills, protecting the integrity of degrees and other credentials, improving access for underrepresented groups, controlling financial barriers to access and choice, conserving the resources of independent education, ethical recruitment and student choice, financial support and management practices, and selective review of master plan provisions. Commission reports relevant to planning for 1982-87 are summarized and an annotated bibliography is appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED213334

THE CHALLENGES AHEAD

A PLANNING AGENDA FOR CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION 1982-1987

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
1020 TWELFTH STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA. 95814

HE014798

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Calif. Postsecondary Educ. Comm
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Commission Report 81-25

November 1981

CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	v
INTRODUCTION	1
THE PUBLIC INTEREST: STATE GOALS	3
THE ENVIRONMENT	7
AN AGENDA: PRIORITIES FOR 1982-1986	15
Improved Planning and Program Review	15
Improving Student Preparation and Skills	16
Protecting the Integrity of Degrees and Other Credentials	17
Improving Access for Underrepresented Groups	19
Controlling Financial Barriers to Access and Choice	20
Conserving the Resource of Independent Education	20
Ethical Recruitment and Student Choice	21
Financial Support and Management Practices	21
Selective Review of Master Plan Provisions	22
IN CONCLUSION: UPDATES OF THE PLAN	25
APPENDIX: Commission Reports Relevant to Planning for 1982-1987	27
REFERENCES	37
INDEX	39

PREFACE

This planning agenda for 1982-1987 is the first of two related reports from the California Postsecondary Education Commission. It contains the Commission's recommendations about priority goals and activities for education beyond high school in California over the next five years.

Its companion document, The Challenges Ahead: Issues in Planning for California Postsecondary Education, 1982-1987, consists of five papers prepared by the staff of the Commission that provide background on the issues discussed in this document. Those five papers describe (1) the planning process for California postsecondary education, (2) financial issues facing the State's colleges and universities, (3) student issues, (4) faculty issues, and (5) demographic, economic, and socio-political changes in the environment of higher education for which colleges and universities must prepare in the near future. Copies of that document, as well as additional copies of this planning agenda, are available on request from the Commission.

The Commission issued its first five-year plan for California postsecondary education, as mandated by the Legislature, in 1975 for the period 1976-1981. Work on this document and its companion began early in 1979. In preparation for this 1982-1987 plan, members of the Commission and its staff consulted widely with educators and public officials throughout the State and in other states. With help from administrators and faculty leaders of both public and independent colleges and universities in California, and from the Commission's Statutory and Student Advisory Committees, they identified major issues facing postsecondary institutions, and obtained opinions about what needed to be done to resolve these issues.

The first results of these activities appeared in July 1980 with the Commission's publication of Issues in Planning for the Eighties--an overview of problems and issues likely to confront colleges and universities during the 1980s. Discussions with readers of that volume, additional research on the part of the Commission staff, and further progress in planning by the several segments of California postsecondary education have now led to the current documents.

The Commission is grateful for the assistance provided during this process by the administrative staffs of the segments and by officials throughout State government. Of course, not all the participants in this process will be in full agreement with the outcome. Responsibility for this planning agenda rests with the Commission. However, the cooperation and assistance we have received reinforces the Commission's commitment, as stated in its 1976 Declaration of Policy, to maximum consultation with all parties involved in the issues facing postsecondary education. Only through such cooperation and consultation can the recommendations of the Commission, such as those in this report, come to fruition.

Pamela Ann Rymer
Chairperson

INTRODUCTION

The California Postsecondary Education Commission has the statutory responsibility to prepare a five-year plan for postsecondary education and to integrate similar plans of the three public segments. "Plans" and "planning" usually connote detailed analyses, for example, of enrollment projections and their implications for State objectives. This brief document--the Commission's five-year plan for 1982-87--does not purport to provide such analyses, although many of these may be found in Commission staff papers and in segmental plans and studies. (See the Appendix of this document for a list of Commission papers and reports related to planning issues.) The brevity of this current Commission plan should not imply that detailed quantitative and qualitative analyses are unimportant--indeed, the Commission has published numerous studies in the past several years that bear directly on the problems facing California postsecondary education in the 1980s. Rather, brevity is dictated by the need to derive from these analyses a concise statement of the current conditions and future directions of California postsecondary education.

The Commission's coordinating responsibility spans not only the three public segments and the independent colleges and universities, but all education in California beyond high school. With this breadth of responsibility, technical analysis of, for example, differential enrollment patterns at 136 public and more than 300 private institutions would focus attention on details rather than on the broader problems and policy issues confronting California postsecondary education. Commission, segmental, and institutional staffs must analyze such critical issues. The Commission's effort, on the other hand, is best directed to identification of statewide issues for legislative, segmental and institutional resolution--and to subsequent review and mediation of these resolutions. The Commission sees the development of a structure or context for planning and action by the public and independent sectors as far more critical to the State's interest than either recapitulation of data and analyses found elsewhere or a restatement of the Commission workplan.

Pervasive fiscal, enrollment, and other uncertainties make it difficult to predict postsecondary education's environment three or four years hence. The Commission believes that these uncertainties

will, at the campus level, require new and greater emphasis on rigorous examination of institutional programs and missions in order to maximize the use of available resources. At the Commission level, however, the same uncertainties demand a different role for statewide leadership than in the past, a role that includes defining the boundaries of segmental and institutional planning. These boundaries must be precise enough for realistic, operational planning but, at the same time, broad enough to accommodate the wide variety of institutional responses that cannot be foreseen but that unique situations will require.

In this document, therefore, the Commission first reviews the State's goals for postsecondary education and then summarizes the major environmental factors that influence pursuit of these goals. Given the goals and the environment, the Commission lists nine items on its planning agenda for postsecondary education for the coming five years, noting the major areas that will be addressed in updates of this plan in each of the next three years.

THE PUBLIC INTEREST: STATE GOALS

California's public and independent institutions of postsecondary education serve both society in general and the particular needs of a diverse citizenry. Each institution plays a unique role in meeting the needs of its own constituency, as well as the needs of its geographical area. Together, all are part of a coordinated State educational system. While California's system is not immune from criticism, few states or even nations now offer their citizens the educational opportunities provided by California's more than 400 degree-granting institutions.

The Commission's task is to preserve and enhance the State's educational system by developing and maintaining reasonable coherence among the segments and institutions. It is therefore essential that the Commission make clear its understanding of the goals which the State seeks to achieve through the system. The Commission does this in full recognition that the present system is as much the result of continuing adaptation to changing conditions as it is the conscious outcome of formal goals and objectives that characterize central planning. In rare instances, State goals are readily apparent, as in the case, for example, of the establishment of the California Maritime Academy. But, for the most part, the Commission must consider principles and goals at very high levels of generality. The Commission must find, enunciate, and explore such general goals, for--however abstract they may be--the attainment of these goals is the ultimate criterion of successful coordination.

The Commission does not set State goals for postsecondary education in the manner that, for example, the Regents of the University of California or the Trustees at Stanford University set goals for their institutions. State goals are found in the Constitution, in legislation, in history, and in informed current public opinion. In its analytic and planning processes, the Commission accepts explicit goals, clarifies and articulates implicit or unclear goals, and pursues these goals in its day-to-day coordinating activities. Although it does not generate State goals itself, the Commission recommends State policies and goals to California's executive and legislative officers and to the segmental and institutional governing boards. A major role of the Commission is reconciliation of legislative and governing board actions and proposals with overarching State goals and policies that span California's enormous range of educational institutions and agencies.

In its first Five-Year Plan (1975, pp. 13-16), the Commission stated some 31 State goals that have continuing relevance, but which, for purposes of the present document, may be subsumed under three goals of greater generality:

- Access: Sufficient institutions, faculty, and programs to allow every qualified California resident to participate in the type of undergraduate education beyond high school for which he or she is qualified, without restrictions due to sex, ethnicity, socio-economic level or cultural background.

- Excellence: Institutions and programs that provide instruction, research, and public service for California and its residents that are commensurate with the needs of the people of the State and are at least equal to or better than those provided by any other state.

- Responsibility: Fiscal and programmatic management that encourages individual, institutional, segmental, and State accountability and initiative in order to facilitate access and promote excellence.

The Commission finds no lack of evidence for the existence of these State goals. The 1960 Master Plan explicitly urged each segment to "strive for excellence in its sphere" (Liaison Committee, 1960, p. 199). But more important, the Commission believes, was the Master Plan's pervasive concern for access--for providing "abundant collegiate opportunities for qualified young people" (p. 27). California's tripartite structure for governance and coordination has had such lasting impact that it is sometimes forgotten that that structure was a means to the largely implicit goal of providing access and choice to an unprecedented number of students. This implicit goal was made explicit in the Legislature's subsequent statement that "each resident of California who has the capacity and motivation to benefit from higher education should have the opportunity to enroll in an institution of higher education" (Education Code, Section 22521). State interest in a responsible coordinated system was implicit in the establishment of the State University system, the Board of Governors, and the Commission, in addition to the already existing University Board of Regents and State Board of Education. While some may argue with the Commission's current description of the goals of "access," "excellence," and individual and institutional "responsibility," it is important that the goals be explicitly stated, however self-evident they may appear. It is important also that they be made explicit as a context for discussion and analysis of both emerging tensions in, and the current environment of, postsecondary education.

At the highest level of generality, access, excellence, and responsibility are consistent and reinforcing State goals. It is at least arguable that, absent limitations on fiscal and other resources, each goal might be pursued without adverse implications for any other. But in the 1980s, resources will be limited; other State services will vie with postsecondary education for finite public funds, and business and industry will compete with colleges and universities for professional and technical specialists. In the current context of fiscal stringency, some tension among the goals is inevitable. The Commission does not wish to overemphasize the extent of possible tension at the State level; it does not expect any drastic changes at that level given reasonable continuity of State financial support. However, tensions will appear at the institutional level, for hard choices will be required in distributing funds: adding resources to one program may well require withdrawing them from another with very real implications for the faculty and students in both. The tension is real and the public interest is clear: access is valuable to students and society only if it is access to high-quality education. Access to anything less diminishes both the institution and the student.

The Commission's simple statement of the three goals belies the complexity that their implementation entails. As the Commission has summarized them, the goals of access, excellence, and responsibility have remained virtually unchanged since the 1960 Master Plan. What has changed, and dramatically so, is the environment in which these goals must be realized.

THE ENVIRONMENT

The environmental changes and factors that the Commission considers most relevant to State goals for postsecondary education in the 1980s can be roughly classified into three types. The two most important are (1) changes with fairly direct implications for the 1960 Master Plan that can be said to be "internal" to the education system, and (2) "external" demographic, economic, and socio-political changes and trends in the society of which the system is a part. However, neither desired continuity nor change will flow automatically from recognition of past changes or future probabilities: a third determinant of the environment and the Commission's agenda includes the planning structures and procedures of the three public segments.

The 1960 Master Plan continues to dominate the environment of post-secondary education in California. Under it, the State Colleges were organized under their own trustees and the Coordinating Council for Higher Education--the predecessor of the Commission--was created. The Master Plan laid the groundwork for the Community College system, and limited freshman and sophomore enrollments in the University and the State University to encourage attendance at two-year institutions.

The Master Plan is undoubtedly the single most important expression of State goals, and its major concepts and implementing structures underwent rigorous and comprehensive review in the early 1970s. Its implicit major goal of broad access to quality education is unchanged. The structural means to this end--segmental differentiation of function and of student eligibility pools--continue to serve California well. The Commission is not aware of serious proposals or pressure for substantial departure from the Master Plan's broad major premises, but it does recognize that at least five important internal changes relevant to the State's agenda have taken place over the past 20 years:

- The State's interest in education after high school has extended beyond "higher education" in colleges and universities to include all of "postsecondary education," including proprietary and vocational/technical schools, the educational activities of libraries, museums, business, industry, labor, and government, and educational and counseling services. Coupled with technological advances,

this transition has not been one of words alone: it has meant a broader view of opportunities for learning beyond classroom instruction and beyond the traditional college years.

- Student financial aid has not only increased dramatically, its emphasis has broadened from encouraging attendance at independent institutions of those students whose needs were solely financial, to explicit and direct encouragement of students who historically did not continue their education because of economic or cultural factors.

- The Master Plan projected new and expanded public postsecondary campuses that are now realities. No longer abstractions, they are mature institutions that often differ from others within the same segment almost as much as from those in other segments.

- Students are not only many times more numerous than in 1960, they are much more diverse: they are older; a majority are women; they come from widely varying economic and ethnic backgrounds; and, on the average, they are scholastically less well prepared for collegiate work than were their 1960 counterparts.

- In 1960, 63 junior colleges enrolled some 290,000 students; in 1980, 106 community colleges in 70 districts enrolled more than 1,100,000 students. In 1960, local funds predominated two-year college support, with the State funding only some 30 percent of operating costs; in 1981, the proportions are reversed. In 1960 and for a decade thereafter, the collegiate and transfer functions of the two-year colleges were seen as threats to their vocational and technical responsibilities. In 1981, there is concern that the latter responsibilities may overwhelm the former.

Changes in the 1960 Master Plan conditions and assumptions--internal environmental factors--are not separated by a firm line from a legion of critical "external" factors that have implications beyond the educational enterprise. Societal pressure for equal employment opportunities for women and minorities, for example, is reflected in the increased diversity of enrollments in all segments. At least three "external" changes or trends in society at large are having, and will continue to have, significant influence on postsecondary education in the 1980s.

The first and perhaps the most clearly documented, external trend is demographic. Although California's population is expected to increase, it is the composition of the population--the mix of age and ethnic groups--that may have the more profound effect on postsecondary education. The changing age profile is a certainty:

- The college-age population of 18-24 year olds will decline from a peak of 2.9 million in 1982 to a low of about 2.45 million in 1992.

- The young adult population of the post-World War II babies (25-34 years) will continue to grow until it will be nearly double the size of the 18-24 year old population in the early 1990s.

- The older adult population--those over 65--will outnumber the 18-24 year old group within the next ten years, a situation that has not existed since about 1961.

The probable effect of the increasingly older population is difficult to predict. Students who are 18-24 years old have made up the great majority of full-time students in the past, and it may be expected that future enrollments will drop as overall numbers in the 18-24 year old age group declines. It is probable that the older age cohorts, given their size and political influence, will make different demands on postsecondary education than did the traditional 18-24 year old group. The changing mix of age groups is complicated by budgetary formulas that distribute State funds to public institutions based on numbers of full-time students, for the older the students, the more likely that they attend part time and that their interests are in non-degree, non-credit programs that are not generally supported by State funds. The extent to which current academic and vocational programs and funding patterns can--or should--change to accommodate different age groups will be a continuing issue in the 1980s.

The second critical demographic factor is the increasing proportion of ethnic minorities in California's population, a trend already clearly evident in the larger cities. This changing ethnic composition has three aspects of particular relevance to the State goal of access. First, in comparison to the Caucasian population, minority students--other than Asian--generally have a lower rate of persistence in high school. Second, of those who do graduate, fewer meet the eligibility standards of the University and State University. Third, more of these students--particularly those from families newly arrived in this country--have severe English-language problems. California has, in fact, received more than a third of the Indochinese refugees who have entered the United States in recent years, and the Department of Finance estimates that the State will have absorbed over 200,000 refugees by the end of 1981. California's Asian population--including Filipinos--is the largest of any state and is expanding significantly. In addition, California's Hispanic population, also the largest in the country, has the highest birth rate of any ethnic group. Minority groups have not generally participated in postsecondary education in proportion to their numbers in the population, and as these groups become proportion-

ately larger in the State's population, statewide enrollments could drop more sharply than the decline in numbers of 18-24 year olds would suggest.

The changing age mix of the population, and the increasing proportion of minorities and non-English speaking persons in California's population will have different effects on different institutions. Some institutions may grow; others may lose a substantial portion of their enrollments. None, however, will be immune from the implications of demographic change.

Economic factors constitute a second and far less predictable group of external environmental factors. Inflation is expected to continue and gradually moderate. But an inflationary economy has already had a severe impact on institutional budgets: relatively fixed costs--equipment, supplies, maintenance, and energy--have increased more rapidly than have the specific funds available for them. Two other aspects of the economic environment cast a shadow over postsecondary education:

- Local, State, and national labor markets change rapidly and sometimes unpredictably; schools and colleges adapt to these changing markets, but do not do so easily or swiftly. A general shift in student demand from the humanities to more occupationally oriented programs is now statistically demonstrable, and must be a factor in academic program and resource planning. However, even when improved responsiveness to demand may be warranted, talking about moving funds to respond to such demands is easier than accomplishing these moves. Institutions are stable because they are held together by a web of interrelated programs, personnel, and facilities, and whether one calls this phenomenon "stability" or "inertia," it is not easily upset.

- The outlook for State revenues and expenditures is clouded. The State's budgetary surplus is now exhausted. The impact of recent limitations on State fiscal authority in Proposition 13 is readily apparent: budgetary reductions for the University and State University totaled over $30 million in the two years following the passage of Proposition 13. In the Community Colleges, the aftermath of Proposition 13 has been radically new, complex, and often confusing funding procedures, as well as new dependence on State rather than local support.

Inflation, erratic labor markets, shifting student objectives, and constraints on State revenues and expenditures are all part of an uncertain economic environment. However, unless significant dislocations in the State's economy or drastic structural changes in State finance occur, the Commission does not expect further abrupt or

substantial changes in the manner or level of State fiscal support for postsecondary education. It does see the prospect of greater competition for State funds than in the past and of the need for more rigorous allocation of these funds within segments and institutions.

The third and final group of external environmental factors are "socio-political." Consisting of the attitudes of the public and their political representatives toward government, work, family, community, and--perhaps derivatively--toward education, these are the least predictable environmental factors. They are also the most difficult to categorize. Nevertheless, four aspects of the socio-political environment seem particularly relevant to postsecondary education:

- The public currently views the integrity of major political and social institutions with skepticism. Public confidence in the value of education itself has remained high, and educational institutions seem to have fared somewhat better than many other public and private "establishment" organizations. But public concern about effective management, academic standards, and the integrity of degrees can be expected to continue.

- Both State and federal agencies have increased their demands for accountability by public service organizations. For postsecondary education, these mandates for compliance have become, many believe, more numerous and complex than necessary. The admitted need for governmental assurance that funds are properly spent and that directives are followed must be weighed more carefully than in the past against the costs of compliance. And costs must be measured in time, in eroded responsibility, and in loss of initiative, as well as in dollars.

- A diffuse public desire for social justice comes to focus in postsecondary education's attempts to broaden access to underrepresented groups and to implement affirmative action plans for students, faculty, and staff. Serving these groups--particularly ethnic minorities, older people, and the handicapped--may well require additional money and will assuredly require varying degrees of programmatic change. Postsecondary education must meet increasingly diverse needs without doing so at the expense of equally legitimate historical standards of performance. Institutional administrators will not find it easy to match even the best of intentions with fiscal reality as they grapple with these issues.

- Very much related to the economic factor of uncertain State funding is the increased competition for these funds. Education, transportation, and public health and safety have long held substantially stable "shares" of the State budget, but a shift in these shares may occur. An older population will likely demand better health care, for example, and linguistically different groups will continue to assert bilingual education needs. The question is not one of money alone, but of balancing the sometimes conflicting desires of various groups, which compounds the already difficult legislative problem of determining the "public interest"--a problem that is also shared by education leaders.

The socio-political factors are in many ways the most disturbing elements in the environment. Both population and fiscal change present concrete problems to which annual response must be made, and even without illusions about final resolution, administrators can take some satisfaction that their institutions have accommodated change for one more year. On the other hand, public opinion, whether local or State, is less tangible and harder to identify, but, in the last analysis, may be the most important determinant of both enrollments and budgets for postsecondary education.

The various demographic, economic and socio-political factors must be taken into account in the achievement of State goals. These factors directly influence both the academic program and budget planning process in the three public segments and in the independent sector. The Commission's own program review and budgeting processes and its planning priorities are affected not only by these "external" factors but also by segmental and institutional planning. The Commission is charged with the integration of segmental academic plans, and, realistically, implementation of Commission proposals depends on segmental planning. Moreover, in both theory and practice, segmental planning is, and should be, restrained by historically strong pressures for campus freedom from segmental--and other--central controls over internal, institutional affairs. Individual institutions can be expected to seek substantial flexibility in fiscal and personnel affairs to respond to the uncertainties of the 1980s, yet, at the same time, straitened budgets will require the segmental central offices to carefully control and allocate funds among the campuses and to define the limits of flexibility. Current segmental planning is in transition:

- The University, this past May, released its University of California Planning Statement, Part I: General Campus Academic Issues for the Eighties, which reviews social, economic, and demographic uncertainties in the context of the University's specific mission. The Planning Statement discusses its concerns, principles and policies, and allocates

responsibilities within the University in seven major areas--undergraduate education, graduate and professional education, research, faculty vitality, basic academic skills, student access, and enrollment. Individual campuses are now completing their own specific plans reflecting selective academic development for system review later this year.

- The State University has issued a comprehensive Academic Program and Resource Planning document annually since 1966, stressing details of existing and projected campus programs as well as campus planning and program review procedures. Most recently, stress has been given to the formulation of specific campus missions during the annual planning process and in the review of requests for new instructional programs.

- Planning for the 106 California Community Colleges is perhaps more difficult than in the other two segments because the responsibilities of the Board of Governors are more nearly those of a coordinating board than of a governing board, but at both system and local levels, planning efforts seem to be adjusting to the dislocations that followed the passage of Proposition 13. The Board's current Long-Term Finance Plan (1979) contemplates more structured planning mechanisms for the colleges, including a statement of statewide objectives for which each district will be accountable, in addition to its responsibility for meeting community needs.

In its initial Five-Year Plan (1975), the Commission took the first steps toward integration of segmental plans. Higher priorities and changing segmental procedures have delayed progress beyond these first steps, but the delay may have been beneficial: in the interim, the segments and the Commission have gained invaluable experience with the problems of coping with planning in an uncertain era. Segmental planning documents evidence a broad consensus on the issues which postsecondary education will face in the 1980s. There also appears to be agreement--at least in the senior segments--on the need for more selective institutional development through improved program planning that relates to unique institutional missions. Equally important, the intervening five years have brought about greater understanding of the type of planning that the 1980s will demand. The type of planning is more complex than in the past, for a segmental plan cannot be expected to be a single comprehensive document setting a single course for a fixed period. Rather, as the University's current Planning Statement discusses in some detail, a "plan" will consist of less formally structured but related documents that discuss goals, principles, and proposed actions, with separate analyses and data collections supporting and justifying the actions and recommendations. The ramifications of planning for the 1980s are far from clear, and, as the following agenda indicates,

exploration of segmental planning and the Commission's role in integrating these plans is high on the list of priorities.

Ignoring postsecondary education's weaknesses only assures that they will not be corrected. Similarly, the darker aspects of the probable future must be explored if institutions are to be prepared to overcome them. In the context of rapid social change and pervasive uncertainty, problems loom larger than opportunities, but it must not be forgotten that most current problems arise because California has realized a remarkable degree of success in meeting past challenges, in expanding access, and in supporting institutional quality. Success has not been complete, nor will it ever be in a system as large and complex as California's. Problems there will be, but the Commission shares the belief of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education that these problems are not unsolvable. The Council observed:

> The surrounding environment in the next twenty years will create some special problems that we can already see. It does not, however, determine in advance how well these problems will be solved or how inadequately; human choice, or absence of choice, will settle that. A downward drift in quality, balance, integrity, dynamism, diversity, private initiative, research capability is not only possible--it is quite likely. But it is not required by external events. It is a matter of choice and not just fate. The emphasis should be on "managing for excellence" (1980, p. 117).

The challenge for California postsecondary education is to cope with negative factors in the environment while capitalizing on more positive ones, in order to continue to expand access for all Californians to institutions and programs of increased excellence.

AN AGENDA: PRIORITIES FOR 1982-1987

The nine items on this agenda of priorities for California postsecondary education reflect the Commission's firm belief that past accomplishments need not fall victim to current or expected adversity. The fulfillment of this agenda will provide a strong foundation upon which institutional and segmental faculty and administrators can strive for and obtain extended access, improved quality, and more effective management. The challenges of the 1980s will be overcome primarily in the day-to-day resolution of difficult programmatic, personnel, and fiscal issues by individual administrative and faculty leaders at their particular institutions. However, these decisions must be made in the context of State and segmental planning which identifies State goals and broad policy parameters. Although not sufficient to achieve all State goals, the agenda items proposed here encompass actions that the Commission finds necessary to those ends. The agenda items constitute a context in which necessary and sufficient institutional and individual decisions can be facilitated. Equally important, they outline a framework for careful, discrete, and selective examination of institutional decisions by the segmental governing boards, by local district boards, by the boards of independent institutions, and by the Commission itself. Such examination is essential to maintaining and enhancing the benefits of a coordinated State system of postsecondary education.

The nine agenda items are derived from the three basic statewide goals for postsecondary education: the first three items deal primarily with issues of excellence and quality; the second three with student access and choice; and the final three with issues of improved management and responsibility.

IMPROVED PLANNING AND PROGRAM REVIEW

The State and the public should have greater assurance that each institutional program meets the specific, perhaps unique, standards of quality relevant to it, and that the program is consistent with the role and mission of the institution. To this end, and through improved program review procedures, the three public segments must determine that existing and proposed programs are consistent with segmental plans and with distinctive institutional roles and

missions--missions determined by the needs of society and limited by the numbers and qualifications of faculty, numbers and mix of students, and fiscal projections. The segments and the Commission must facilitate institutional planning and program review by providing a context in which campus administrators and faculty can reexamine programs in the light of current and projected conditions. Particularly in times of fiscal constraints, programs essential to an institution's particular mission must be maintained and improved, sometimes, perhaps, at the expense of other programs less central to its mission. The public segments must analyze institutional plans primarily in terms of their impact on other campuses within the segment; the Commission's program reviews and recommendations will stress the impact of segmental and institutional plans on regional access and other areas of intersegmental and statewide concern.

IMPROVING STUDENT PREPARATION AND SKILLS

Parents, teachers, legislators, and educational administrators are all concerned about the inadequate preparation of increasing numbers of entering college students. The evidence of declining test scores, teacher assessments, employer evaluations, and the increasing demand for remedial courses, all point to a serious decline in the abilities of entering students to read, write, and compute at levels appropriate for collegiate work. The issue of student preparation raises both short- and long-term questions for the K-12 and postsecondary education sectors: what are the problems in the K-12 system which have brought about the decline and what must be done to strengthen the college-preparatory portion of high school curricula; what can be done to encourage more students to undertake the college-preparatory curriculum; what more needs to be done to ensure that non-college-bound students graduate with the necessary basic skills; to what extent should postsecondary education be involved in providing remedial education and how much remediation is appropriate in which segments, given differential missions; and, finally, how is remedial education to be provided and funded at the postsecondary level?

To assist in both clarifying and resolving these issues, the Commission will complete its ongoing study of the nature, extent, and cost of remediation in the three public postsecondary segments. The resulting information should prove useful in making recommendations concerning remedial education activities in the three public segments.

However, the long-range problem of inadequate student preparation cannot be resolved solely at the postsecondary level. Despite the problems of coordinating two separate and decentralized systems of education, innovative approaches combined with funding incentives

can help bridge the operational gap between the two systems, as the California Writing Project has illustrated. Such strategies as clear statements by the colleges and universities of expectations of student preparation, closer relation of course content between schools and colleges, and increased interaction of teachers and professors through teacher exchanges and joint in-service staff development seminars, could well assist in improving the preparation and subsequent performance of students. To assist in resolving the issue of student preparation, the Commission will explore these and other such alternatives with the leaders of secondary education and the postsecondary segments.

PROTECTING THE INTEGRITY OF DEGREES AND OTHER CREDENTIALS

The State and the public deserve assurance of the quality and validity of credentials issued in California. State agencies and citizens increasingly rely on State licenses, professional certificates, and academic degrees as evidence of professional or occupational skill, whether of mechanics or surgeons, instructors or plumbers. As jobs grow more specialized and the public becomes more dependent on the expert judgment of specialists, the use of credentials will most likely grow, despite the complaints of some critics about "credentialism" and our "overly credentialed" society. Credentials can be useful, but only if they are meaningful.

A variety of problems accompanies the use of degrees and credentials. Some degrees and certificates seem to be evidence of specific occupational skill or competence, when they may only be evidence of time spent in a class or meeting room. Some State licensing boards rely too heavily on the accumulation of academic credits as a proxy for demonstrated professional competence. Some employers (including school systems) all too often base their hiring, promotion, and salary increment policies on the accumulation of credits and credentials rather than on job-related skills or performance. Workers sometimes feel obligated to take unnecessary and costly courses to earn the credits that are necessary for career advancement. And despite the imposition of continuing education requirements for relicensure, the professions continue to be troubled by substandard performance on the part of some practitioners.

In addition, past practices of "social promotion" in the elementary and secondary schools and evidence of "grade inflation" in colleges and universities have prompted legislative concern about the maintenance of academic standards. Thus the Legislature has required school districts to give minimum competency tests to students before awarding high school diplomas in order to maintain

the value of these diplomas. Legislators are also discussing whether proficiency examinations in reading, writing, or mathematics should be required of all persons wishing to obtain teaching credentials. In addition, the State University has instituted a writing proficiency requirement that students must pass prior to graduation.

Finally, some entrepreneurs are taking advantage of both California's liberal authorization statutes and the innovations of the "nontraditional education" and "external degree" movements to offer cut-rate credits and discount degrees to customers both here and abroad, thereby bringing into question credentials issued in California. Now that Florida has begun regulating its private and proprietary schools more closely, California is increasingly viewed as the nation's leader in meaningless degrees from substandard private operations and "mail-order" offices.

The Commission believes that improvements are needed in both the quality and use of degrees and credentials in California. The following steps will not solve all the problems associated with credentialism, but they are necessary to avoid the worst of them.

First, to assure the quality and meaning of State licenses, the State should discourage its licensing boards from basing continued licensure or relicensure exclusively on the accumulation of credits, degrees, or continuing education units rather than on demonstration of professionally relevant skills. To this end, the Legislature should encourage and expect licensing boards and professions to develop better tests of these skills.

Second, to assure appropriate standards for academic degrees and the protection of educational consumers and legitimate institutions, the State should upgrade its standards for State-authorized private institutions and strengthen its oversight of the operation of these institutions, particularly in regard to their use of traditional academic degree titles such as the Ph.D.

Third, to avoid the necessity of the Legislature imposing minimum competency testing in higher education, the academic community must assume responsibility for maintaining standards of academic degrees and certificates, and promote consensus about these standards to reduce public confusion about their meaning. In addition, educators and educational institutions should resist the temptation to encourage school districts and other employers, as well as State licensing boards, to use the mere accumulation of credits or credentials for employment and licensing decisions.

Without progress in these directions, legislators and the public will have increased and justifiable concern about the integrity of the degrees and other credentials offered in California.

IMPROVING ACCESS FOR UNDERREPRESENTED GROUPS

In the past several years, the Commission, the Legislature, and the segments have focused considerable attention, effort, and money on increasing access for various groups that are underrepresented at some or all levels of postsecondary education. In the midst of this effort, debate has begun to occur as to what is meant by the term "access," and to what role the State should play in ensuring access. On the one hand, access can be defined as the ability of each California resident "who has the capacity and motivation to benefit from higher education . . . as indicated by his academic performance and commitment to educational advancement" to enroll in an institution of higher education (Education Code, Section 22521). In this sense, access is ensured if the State maintains enough institutions of postsecondary education so that all those citizens capable and motivated to pursue higher education have a place to do so, and it is up to individual citizens to seek out these educational opportunities.

On the other hand, access can be defined as the removal of financial, and socio-cultural barriers to either an individual's or a particular group's participation in higher education. It is "equal and universal accessibility to the system for persons of both sexes and all races, ancestries, incomes, ages, and geographics" (ACR 149, 1974). In this sense, access is not ensured merely by the presence of campuses and staff. Various methods--including financial aid, outreach programs, tutoring and skills development programs--are employed to overcome the barriers and encourage increased participation of various groups that have not traditionally taken advantage of higher education. Included in this definition of access is the concept of retention: simply increasing the number of students from underrepresented groups who enter the institutions is not enough; more important is the number who successfully complete their programs of study.

The Commission believes that access in the first sense has been achieved; it is access in the second sense--the removal of economic and socio-cultural barriers to participation in higher education--to which our efforts must continue to be directed. While some success in increasing access and educational equity has been achieved, underrepresentation of various groups still persists within postsecondary education. It is now appropriate to assess the level of this success, to evaluate the alternative methods and models for overcoming the barriers, and to determine which strategies--particularly coordinated and cooperative ones--addressed to which target groups, must be implemented to finally ensure equity in access to postsecondary education for all of California's citizens. The Commission, in cooperation with the segments, will continue to monitor and evaluate the various affirmative action, outreach, support service, and financial aid programs to this end.

CONTROLLING FINANCIAL BARRIERS TO ACCESS AND CHOICE

The primary considerations in any student's choice of whether and where to participate in postsecondary education should be educational, that is, made in terms of the student's qualifications and educational needs rather than his or her financial situation. The State should not allow development of excessive differentials in cost among the segments--whether in tuition, fees, or other charges--which could distort the distribution of numbers and types of students among the segments by placing certain educational offerings beyond the financial reach of some students. The public segments have prospered under a tripartite structure which gives varying degrees of discretion to segmental governing boards in the realm of student charges. Although segmental discretion should be preserved, the absence of a statewide policy for student charges and the ease with which student fees have been increased to offset State and institutional fiscal constraints, require increased Commission and legislative attention to student aid and fee policies. To these ends:

- As part of their consideration of any proposals for adjusting student charges, the executive and legislative branches, the Commission, and the segments should carefully consider the probable effects on total postsecondary education enrollments, on enrollments and student mix in each segment, and on the demand for student financial aid.

- State funds committed to student financial assistance should be distributed in a manner that assures that those funds are used to maximize the effectiveness of all student financial resources--family, federal, institutional, as well as State--in promoting access and choice. Application procedures and administrative practices should be simplified and program overlap eliminated wherever possible.

- The State should continue to support student financial aid programs which serve the dual objectives of access to, and choice among, all types of postsecondary educational institutions, both public and private.

CONSERVING THE RESOURCE OF INDEPENDENT EDUCATION

The State has a vital interest in preserving a healthy sector of independent, degree-granting colleges and universities. These institutions have contributed significantly to the achievement of State goals by providing educational opportunities of high quality to California citizens. They add an important dimension of diversity of governance and institutional character, and they provide constructive competition with public institutions which has enhanced the quality of public and independent higher education. Therefore:

- The State should continue to maintain financial aid programs which enable students to attend independent colleges and universities.

- The Commission will continue to monitor indicators of the health and stability of independent higher education and report the results to the Governor and the Legislature.

ETHICAL RECRUITMENT AND STUDENT CHOICE

The interests of the individual student and the public are served by efforts of secondary and postsecondary institutions which promote informed choice for students. Information and activities which enable students to identify institutions and programs most appropriate to their needs, interests and qualifications serve the primary goals of access and excellence.

The years immediately ahead contain the hazard that increased competition for students may lead to overly zealous recruiting by postsecondary institutions. Such a situation could lead to the imposition of external controls which could limit the positive potential of cooperation among institutions and segments in information and recruitment. It is therefore incumbent upon the postsecondary community to demonstrate the potential of self-regulation and active cooperation for ensuring accurate information and responsible recruitment. The Commission will work with the segments to arrive at mutually acceptable policy guidelines for institutional and segmental recruitment efforts and to promote active cooperation across segments in the interest of informed student choice.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT AND MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

To the extent that the economic condition of the State allows, the Governor and Legislature should continue the relatively stable patterns of past funding for higher education. To this end, the State should maintain at least the current level of per-student funding in constant dollars. In addition, the executive and legislative branches, the Commission, and the Board of Governors should develop stable, long-term funding procedures for Community Colleges. These procedures should be in place by the 1984 fiscal year, when the current two-year finance mechanism will expire.

Within the framework of State higher education finance, more effective planning, management, and accountability are essential if

colleges and universities are to respond adequately to conditions of uncertainty. To further this end, the Commission will work with the segments to assure that academic and financial planning takes into account reasonably probable contingencies such as the ranges of fiscal, demographic and labor market projections. The Commission will also work with the Legislature and other appropriate State agencies to identify and eliminate externally imposed barriers to effective institutional and segmental management.

SELECTIVE REVIEW OF MASTER PLAN PROVISIONS

As discussed earlier in this document, the 1960 Master Plan set forth the basic tripartite structure of California public postsecondary education, including the important tenets of differentiated functions and eligiblity pools for the three public segments. While the Master Plan has served California well, the important changes in the environment over the past 20 years discussed in the second section of this document warrant a closer look at specific provisions of the Master Plan to determine first whether alterations to the basic tenets have occurred, and second, whether additional modifications should now be made.

As part of its continuing responsibility, the Commission will examine the evolving role of the Community Colleges in light of their current functions and those which were the case at the time of the Master Plan. This review will consider the balance among historic Community College transfer and occupational training functions on the one hand and expanded new educational services on the other.

Related to the examination of the current role of the Community Colleges is the question of the extent to which baccalaureate-bound students can still begin their higher education in Community Colleges and successfully transfer to either the University of California or the California State University and Colleges. Also at issue is the provision that undergraduate enrollments at the University and State University consist of 40 percent freshmen and sophomores and 60 percent juniors and seniors.

The differentiated admissions policies of the Master Plan, which call for the top 12 1/2 percent of public high school graduates to be eligible to attend the University of California and the top 33 1/3 percent to attend the State University, when coupled with certain exceptions provisions, have served to provide an orderly basis upon which to provide higher education opportunities at the public, four-year institutions. These selective policies are linked to open admissions through the Community Colleges. Academic, qualitative,

and fiscal considerations underlie these admissions policies. The Commission, in association with the segments, will monitor the current admissions standards of the four-year segments and the extent to which they result in student selection from the respective Master Plan admissions pools. In addition, the Commission will review proposals which are now under development by the California State University and Colleges and the University of California to modify admissions standards in order to assure better high school preparation for college-level academic work.

IN CONCLUSION: UPDATES OF THE PLAN

The high goals and aspirations of postsecondary education will be tested in the uncertain environment of the 1980s. The Commission cannot foresee all areas in which tests will be critical, and of those that it does foresee, it has selected nine items that it believes necessary to provide the context and to set the boundaries for required and difficult decisions. The Commission found no dearth of issues that were candidates for inclusion on the agenda, and consensus on the nine was not achieved without difficulty. In some cases, issues that might be of great importance to specific groups or at particular campuses were thought to lack statewide implications--for example, the organization of student counseling and tutorial services. In others, the issues had statewide implications, but it was not clear that action at the State level could or should provide resolution--for example, the need for more precise definitions of the many dimensions of instructional quality. Some issues did not appear to be sufficiently well defined at the State level for inclusion in the agenda--the role of television and computer-aided instruction, for example. A critical constellation of faculty issues--tenure and impaction, renewal and development, salaries and collective bargaining--was omitted from the agenda. The Commission's comparative salary studies and its support of competitive salaries will continue, as will its reports on the progress of faculty and staff affirmative action programs; and faculty issues will undoubtedly arise in segmental and State planning and program review. In general, however, the complex interactions among personnel, programs, and budgets must seek resolution by governing boards, institutional administrators, and faculty leaders.

This agenda for the State is, by its very nature, an outline of proposed Commission activity, but it is not a detailed workplan for the next five years. All the agenda items will require continuing attention, but the priorities are the result of differences in emphasis, which may change over time. As currently planned, the three subsequent updates to this planning document will each encompass two or more agenda items. The Commission's first update will focus on a review of State and segmental planning and program review processes, to ensure that those appropriate policies and procedures necessary for management in an uncertain environment are in place. It is contemplated that this review will be complete by

late 1982 or early 1983. The second update will focus on relationships between postsecondary institutions and the public schools, including such issues as student access, choice, retention, preparation, performance, and remediation. The third update will include an examination of State enrollment trends, with particular attention to the impact of the expected reduction in numbers of high school graduates and to the distribution of students across institutions. While unanticipated crises may force alterations in these plans, the Commission hopes that this early identification of the particular areas of emphasis for future updates will assist segmental and legislative policy makers in focusing their attention and efforts on those issues of greatest concern to postsecondary education in the next five years.

APPENDIX

COMMISSION REPORTS RELEVANT TO PLANNING FOR 1982-1987

The following Commission documents, listed chronologically, provide background for the present report.

1975

Planning for Postsecondary Education in California: A Five-Year Plan, 1976-1981. Commission Report 75-4, December 1975.

This first five-year plan of the Commission proposed 31 goals for California postsecondary education and, to accomplish them, recommended action in 11 priority areas: developing a statewide information system, assessing adult education needs, financing postsecondary education, regulating private vocational institutions, encouraging regional planning, assuring equal educational opportunities, evaluating program quality, offering educational and career counseling, planning vocational education, providing student financial aid, and maintaining academic freedom and collegiality despite collective bargaining.

1976

Through the Open Door: A Study of Patterns of Enrollment and Performance in California's Community Colleges (Final Report). Commission Report 76-1, February 1976.

In response to Senate Bill 772 (1972), the Coordinating Council for Higher Education undertook a longitudinal study of a sample of about 35,000 first-time students in 32 California Community Colleges representing those in existence at that time. Council staff collected data relating to student characteristics, patterns of enrollment, objectives, and achievement of these objectives over a period of three and one-half years. The final report, adopted by the Commission in 1976, contains findings about the evolution of these two-year institutions into comprehensive Community Colleges serving students with very diverse characteristics and objectives, with recommendations about changes needed to bring about greater consonance between college practices and the needs of these new students. A subsequent report, "California Community College Students Who Transfer" (May 1979), describes students in the sample who transferred to the University of California and the California State University and Colleges during the mid-1970s.

Regional Planning for Postsecondary Education: Objectives, Obstacles, Alternatives. Commission Report 76-3, February 1976.

In response to Assembly Concurrent Resolution 159 (1974), this report reviews regional postsecondary planning in four other states--Pennsylvania, New York, Illinois, and Minnesota--and in California; presents four alternative plans for creating regional planning councils, either on a voluntary or mandatory basis; and recommends a "Competitive Proposal Pilot Program," whereby council based on existing regional consortia would develop proposals to address the educational needs of their regions, and the State would fund some of these proposals after competitive review.

The Role of the Commission in California Postsecondary Education: A Declaration of Policy. Commission Report 76-10, December 1976.

States the Commission's view of itself in terms of seven characteristics (including commitment to maximum consultation with all parties involved in every issue, and the belief that all agencies and institutions involved with postsecondary education are subject to evaluation by the Commission); outlines the Commission's functions under four headings--clearinghouse, planning, evaluation, and coordination; and identifies functions inappropriate for the Commission, such as administering educational programs itself.

1977

Planning for Postsecondary Education in California: A Five-Year Plan Update, 1977-1982. Commission Report 77-1, January 1977.

Reports progress on each of the Commission's programs designed to achieve the goals identified in the Commission's first five-year plan and identifies seven more priority issues to be addressed: access and retention for equal educational opportunity; lifelong learning, tuition, fees, and access in public postsecondary education; declining skills development; stabilized, declining, and shifting enrollments; financial conditions of independent institutions; and accreditation.

1978

Planning for Postsecondary Education in California: A Five-Year Plan Update, 1978. Commission Report 78-1, January 1978.

Reports progress on issues identified in the earlier two planning documents; reviews changes in the State's demographic profile and unemployment rates as they affect colleges and universities; and examines the organization and governance of vocational education and affirmative action efforts for academic administrators and faculty; but does not add more items either to the Commission's goals or agenda, awaiting a successful resolution of the issues already identified.

A State Plan for Increasing the Representation of Students With Disabilities in Public Higher Education. Commission Report 78-9, June 1978.

Responds to ACR 201 (1976) calling on the three public segments to prepare plans to provide for "addressing and overcoming, by 1980, the underrepresentation of handicapped students in the makeup of the student bodies of institutions of public higher education as compared to the general proportion of such students in recent California high school graduation classes" and requesting the Commission to "integrate and transmit the plans to the Legislature."

Director's Report, 9/78: Financing California Postsecondary Education After Proposition 13: Some Trends and Issues. Commission Report 78-12, September 1978.

Contains comparative information on the 1978-79 budgets for the three segments of California public higher education, and analyzes funding trends for each of the segments' operating and capital outlay budgets in light of the passage of Proposition 13.

Access in a Broader Context: College-Going Rates in California. Commission Report 78-14, October 1978.

Analyzes college-going rates of high school graduates between 1974 and 1977 by comparing the number of high school graduates per county with the enrollment of first-time freshmen aged 19 or younger in the State's colleges and universities; concludes that approximately 60 percent of the State's high school graduates enroll in college and that this percentage has not declined over the three-year period; and also reports the numbers of students transferring from Community Colleges to baccalaureate-level institutions. (Updated and expanded in each succeeding year.)

Formal Education and Training Programs Sponsored in California by Business, Industry, Government, and the Military: Part of a Series of Reports on Lifelong Learning. Commission Report 78-17, December 1978.

Reviews national and State data regarding the extent of adult education conducted or funded by non-academic organizations, primarily for their employees; describes the links between these organizations and educational institutions, in particular, those arranged by "educational brokers;" and raises policy questions about these programs and the work of these brokers.

Planning for Postsecondary Education in California: A Five-Year Plan Update, 1979. Commission Report 78-18, December 1978.

As the fourth in the Commission's five-year plan series, provides an overview of progress on 29 specific issues, ranging from access and retention to basic skills deficiencies, regional programming, and facilities planning, in order to determine which issues remain for action during the 1980s.

1979

A Health Sciences Education Plan for California, 1978-80. Commission Report 79-9, July 1979.

In response to Assembly Bill 1748 (1976), calling for a biennial health sciences education plan from the Commission and, in alternate years, a health manpower plan from the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development, this report examines the nature of educational programs in five major health professions--medicine, nursing, dentistry, pharmacy, and optometry; determines for each field the number, enrollment, and graduate output of the programs; reviews manpower problems in the professions; and recommends for each field State policies regarding the need for new programs, recruitment practices (particularly in regard to affirmative action), and certification.

Report of the Statewide Task Force on Services to Students With Disabilities, August 22, 1979.

Responding to June 1979 supplemental budget language, this report of a task force composed of representatives of the three public segments of higher education, the Department of Finance, and the Department of Rehabilitation under the leadership of the Commission, presents a common set of policy guidelines for the segments to use in creating and operating disabled student educational service programs.

Using Instructional Media Beyond Campus: One in a Series of Reports on Lifelong Learning. Commission Report 79-10, 1979.

Describes instructional media that are being used or might be used to extend educational opportunities into the community, including television, radio, instructional tapes, and newspapers; recommends ways to expand and coordinate their use in the interests of widespread lifelong-learning opportunities.

1980

The Price of Admission: An Assessment of the Impact of Student Charges on Enrollments and Revenues in California Public Higher Education, Revised Edition. Commission Report 80-2, February 1980.

To help estimate the likely impact of increases in student charges at the State's colleges and universities on college-going rates and institutional income, this report describes the results of a computer simulation model testing various student charge and financial aid policies in terms of their projected revenue and enrollment effects, with projections for each segment in terms of students' residency status, level of program, and family income.

Uncertainty in Public Higher Education: Response to Stress at Ten California Colleges and Universities, by Frank M. Bowen and Lyman A. Glenny. January 1980.

Surveys the impact of enrollment changes and financial stress at five Community Colleges, three State University campuses, and two campuses of the University of California in light of a variety of institutional characteristics; points to implications of these stresses for campus planning and program review procedures, segmental governance, and statewide budgeting.

Degrees of Diversity: Off-Campus Education in California. Commission Report 80-5, March 1980.

Traces the history of the off-campus education and "external degree" movements in other states and in California; summarizes the extent of these offerings in the State; examines questions of access, finance, and quality regarding the programs; and recommends State action to bring coherence to these programs, particularly in the State University and

indirectly in independent institutions, by establishing priorities for State support of certain instruction.

Equal Educational Opportunity in California Postsecondary Education: Part III. Commission Report 80-6, March 1980.

In response to Assembly Concurrent Resolution 151 (1974), calling for overcoming "ethnic, economic, and sexual underrepresentation" in public colleges and universities, compared to recent high school graduates, this report describes the barriers to overcoming the underrepresentation of ethnic minorities and women; identifies the programs underway to assure equal educational opportunity; reviews "special action/exemption" admissions policies for affirmative action; reports on intersegmental consortia and financial aid programs relevant to equal opportunity; and recommends steps toward a coordinated statewide effort at affirmative action.

Director's Report, 4/80: Proposition Nine: California's Income Tax Initiative of 1980: An Update. Commission Report 80-8, April 1980.

Discusses the likely impact for 1980-81 and beyond if Proposition Nine were to pass, including five budgetary approaches the State might adopt in response to such a proposition.

Issues in Planning for the Eighties. Commission Report 80-11, June 1980.

As the first step in the Commission's development of the current five-year plan, this report contains five staff papers describing the state of postsecondary education in California, environmental factors likely to influence it during the 1980s, changes in student characteristics, faculty issues, and statewide and segmental planning. (Updated versions of three of these papers appear in the companion volume to this present report.)

Signals for Change: Stress Indicators for Colleges and Universities. A Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission by Lyman A. Glenny and Frank M. Bowen, September 1980.

As a follow-up to Uncertainty in Public Higher Education, this report identifies 35 "indicators" that might forecast the need for institutional response to impending problems--13 of them over which institutions have little or no control

(such as social and economic changes, occupational trends, and changes in student interests and average class load), and 22 which institutions can, to some extent control (such as admissions standards, unit costs, and drop-out rates).

Director's Report, 1/80: Major Issues in Community College Finance. Commission Report 80-19, November 1980.

Presents an overview of the financing of higher education in California; reviews changes in Community College financing after Proposition 13; analyzes Assembly Bill 8; and reacts to five questions posed by the Assembly Education Committee regarding Community College finance, including statutory versus budget-act approaches to finance, the effectiveness of incremental cost funding, and the mission of Community Colleges in light of limited State resources.

1981

Director's Report, 1/81: Surveying the Seventies, California Higher Education. Commission Report 81-1B, January 1981.

Reviews major developments affecting California postsecondary institutions during the 1970s, including student enrollment trends, the end of the postwar "baby boom," the expansion of financial aid, and the effect of the "taxpayer's revolt" on funding for each of the segments of higher education.

Review and Evaluation of the Private Postsecondary Education Act of 1977. Commission Report 81-1C, January 1981.

In response to provisions of the Private Postsecondary Education Act of 1977, directing the Commission to help review and evaluate the implementation of the Act, this report reviews the effectiveness of the Act in assuring the quality of programs offered by private postsecondary institutions and assuring consumer protection from substandard educational enterprises.

A Report on Health Sciences Education Planning for California, 1980-1982. Commission Report 81-2, January 1981.

The second of the Commission's biennial planning documents on education for the health professions, this report updates information from the earlier report on the five major health professions and offers first-time facts on the number,

enrollment, and graduate output of programs in some 70 other health fields, including midwifery, medical technology, hospital administration, and health education.

One World in Common: General Education in a National, Statewide, and Historical Context. Commission Report 81-8, March 1981.

Defines "general education;" traces its history in America and in California; describes contemporary models of liberal learning; places current decisions facing the segments regarding general education requirements in national and historical perspective; and raises both specific issues confronting the segments as well as philosophical issues transcending segmental boundaries involving liberal learning.

Director's Report, 4/81: Science and Engineering Education for the 1980s and Beyond. Commission Report 81-9, April 1981.

Discusses the implications for California's schools and colleges of the trends and recommendations reported by the National Science Foundation and the Department of Education in their study, Science and Engineering Education for the 1980s and Beyond, which projects potential manpower shortages, for example, in computer professions but surpluses in others.

Quality and Accountability: An Evaluation of Statewide Program Review Procedures. A Consultant Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission by Frank M. Bowen and Lyman A. Glenny.

Describes current program review or evaluation procedures at the institutional, segmental, and statewide levels, and their relation to planning and budgeting in higher education; offers nine recommendations regarding program review to strengthen State and segmental planning, simplify the review of new programs, and increase accountability.

Missions and Functions of the California Community Colleges: One in a Series of Staff Papers for Discussion. Commission Report 81-14, May 1981.

To stimulate widespread discussion of directions and priorities of the California Community Colleges, on the assumption that "unless the Community Colleges make programmatic choices and set budget priorities, they will probably

do many things less well and some things unsatisfactorily in the future," this staff paper reviews the traditional missions of the Community Colleges and discusses six problems facing them, including improving articulation with the schools, providing remediation, and assuring transfer opportunities to baccalaureate-level institutions.

Director's Report, 6/81: Summary of a Joint Meeting of Members of the California State Board of Education and the California Postsecondary Education Commission, March 25, 1981. Commission Report 81-15, June 1981.

Describes the discussion during a day-long meeting of four State Board of Education members and five Commissioners regarding needed coordination between the schools and higher education in four areas--improving the preparation of college-bound youth, serving the educational needs of unemployed but out-of-school youth, improving program articulation, and implementing affirmative action; and lists 11 areas of possible collaboration for future discussion--including teacher preparation and sharing of facilities.

Director's Report 7/81: Effects of the 1981-82 Budget on the Three Public Segments of Postsecondary Education. Commission Report 81-16, July 1981.

Reports State funding for each of the three segments of California public postsecondary education following passage of the 1981-82 Budget Bill, and notes supplemental language in the Budget Act applicable to the Commission and the segments.

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Education and Youth Policy. Commission Report 81-17, July 1981.

Discusses national and State evidence of the problems of unemployed out-of-school youth; describes programs designed to help these young people acquire training and employment; and recommends action for improving the effectiveness of these programs, particularly by the interagency committee created to coordinate State resources for employment recruitment, training, and placement.

REFERENCES

Board of Governors, California Community Colleges. Long-Term Finance Plan: Recommendations for the 1980s. Sacramento: California Community Colleges, 1979.

California Postsecondary Education Commission. Planning for Postsecondary Education in California: A Five-Year Plan, 1976-1981. Commission Report 75-4, December 1975. Sacramento: The Commission, 1975.

California State University and Colleges. Academic Program and Resource Planning in the California State University and Colleges. Long Beach: Office of the Chancellor, California State University and Colleges, annually.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. Three Thousand Futures: The Next Twenty Years for Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Liaison Committee of the State Board of Education and The Regents of the University of California. A Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-1975. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1960.

University of California. University of California Planning Statement, Part I: General Campus Academic Issues for the Eighties. Berkeley: University of California, 1981.

INDEX

Access to postsecondary education as a State goal, 4-5, 15, 19
  Commission reports on, 29, 32
Accountability, cost of demands for, 11
Admissions criteria of public universities, 23
Affirmative action for students
  as part of movement for social justice, 11, 19
  Commission report on, 32
Age composition of California's population, 8-9
Agenda of priority actions to achieve State goals for postsecondary education, 15-23
Asian population in California, 9

Barriers to access to postsecondary education, 19, 20
Basic skills of students, 16-17
Board of Governors, California Community Colleges, 13
Bowen, Frank A., reports by, 31, 32, 34

California Community Colleges, 8, 13, 22
  Commission reports on, 27, 33, 34
California Postsecondary Education Commission
  first five-year plan (1975), 3, 4, 13, 27
  planning responsibilities, 1
  reports, 27-35
California State University and Colleges, 13, 22-23
California Writing Project, 17
Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, 14
Chicano (Hispanic) population in California, 9
College-age youth, numbers of, 8, 9
College-going rates, Commission reports on, 29
Community Colleges, 7, 22
  Commission reports on, 27, 33, 34
Competency testing, 17, 18
Competition for State funds, 12
Consumer protection for students, 18

Degrees and credentials, integrity of, 17-18
Demographic changes in California, 8-10
Department of Finance, 9
Disabilities, students with, 11
  Commission reports on, 29, 30

Economic barriers to postsecondary education, 19, 20
Economic factors affecting postsecondary education, 10-11
Enrollment trends
  Commission report on, 33
  Planned Commission study of, 26
Environment of postsecondary education, 7, 14
Equal educational opportunity, 4, 19
  Commission report on, 32
Ethical recruitment of students, 21
Ethnic minorities and higher education, 9-10
Excellence as a State goal, 4-5, 15
External degree movement, 18
  Commission report on, 31-32

Faculty salaries and other issues, 25
Filipino population in California, 9
Finance, Department of, 9
Financial aid, 8, 19, 20
Financial barriers to postsecondary education, 19, 20
Financing of higher education, 21-22

General education, Commission report on, 34
Glenny, Lyman A., reports by, 31, 32, 34
Goals for California postsecondary education, 3-5, 15
Grade inflation in higher education, 17

Handicaps, students with, 11
  Commission reports on, 29, 30
Health sciences education, Commission reports on, 30, 33-34
Hispanic population in California, 9

Independent colleges and universities, 20-21
Inflation, 9
Integrity of degrees and credentials, 17-18

Justice, social, 11

Licensure, State, 17-18

Management, responsibility for effective, as a State goal, 4, 15, 21-22
Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 4, 7, 8, 22
  proposed review of selected provisions, 22-23
Minimum competency testing, 17, 18
Minorities in higher education, 9-10

Need for planning, 1-2, 12-13, 14
Non-English speaking Californians, 9-10

Off-campus programs, Commission report on, 31-32
Outreach programs, 19

Planning
  Commission reports on, 27, 28, 30, 32
  in California postsecondary education, 12-13
  need for, 1-2, 15, 21
  planned Commission review of, 25
Population changes in California, 8-10
"Postsecondary education," meaning of, 7
Preparation of students, 16-17
Priorities for State action, 15-23
Private colleges and universities, 20-21
Proficiency examinations in education, 17
Program review
  as State priority, 15-16
  planned Commission examination of, 25
  Report to Commission on, 34
Proposition 13, effects of, 10, 13, 29
Public attitudes toward education, 11

Quality (excellence) as State goal, 4-5, 15

Recruitment of students by institutions, 21
Refugees, 9
Remediation, 16-17
Responsibility as a State goal, 4-5, 15
Review of Master Plan provisions, 22-23
Review of programs, 15-16

Schools, elementary and secondary, 16-17
  relations with higher education, 17, 26
  Commission report on relations, 35
Skills, student academic, 16-17
Social justice, 11
Social promotion, 17
Socio-political trends in California, 11-12
Standards for degrees and credentials, 17-18
State finance, 10-11
State funding of colleges and universities, 21-22
  Commission report on, 35
State goals for postsecondary education, 3-5, 15
State licensure, 17-18
Student charges for higher education, 20
  Commission report on, 31
Student choice of institution, 21
Student financial aid, 7, 20
Student preparation and skills, 16-17
Students
  diversity of, 8, 11
  numbers of, planned study of, 26

Television, 25
  Commission report on, 31
Transfer students, 22
Tuition and fee differentials, 20

University of California admissions standards, 22, 23
  Planning Statement (1981), 12, 13
Updates proposed to the Five-Year Plan, 25

Youth, unemployed, Commission report on, 35

A companion document to this planning agenda is The Challenges Ahead: Issues in Planning for California Postsecondary Education, 1982-1987 -- a set of five papers prepared by the staff of the California Postsecondary Education Commission and available without charge from the Commission.

The Commission was created by the Legislature and the Governor in 1974 as the successor to the California Coordinating Council for Higher Education in order to coordinate and plan for education in California beyond the high school. As a state agency, the Commission is responsible for assuring that the State's resources for postsecondary education are utilized effectively and efficiently; for promoting diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to the needs of students and society; and for advising the Legislature and the Governor on statewide educational policy and funding.

The Commission consists of 15 members. Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Governor. The other six represent the major educational systems of the State.

The Commission holds regular public meetings throughout the year at which it takes action on staff studies and adopts positions on legislative proposals affecting postsecondary education. Further information about the Commission, its meetings, its staff, and its other publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814; telephone (916) 445-7933.